



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/712,033	11/14/2000	Edward James Rozhon	11133-004-999	9130
20583	7590	12/20/2006		
JONES DAY 222 EAST 41ST ST NEW YORK, NY 10017			EXAMINER MARX, IRENE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		12/20/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/712,033	ROZHON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Irene Marx	1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-38, 40 and 75-93 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-38, 40, and 75-93 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1651

DETAILED ACTION

To facilitate processing of papers at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, it is recommended that the Application Serial Number be inserted on every page of claims and/or amendments filed.

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/27/06 has been entered.

Claims 21-38, 40, and 75-93 are being considered on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 21-38, 40, and 75-93 are/remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davenport *et al.* (Pediatric Pulmonology, S13 Abstract 34, August 16, 1996) taken with Ubillas *et al.*, Masquelier, Wursch and Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences and applicants' admissions.

Davenport *et al.* teach the oral administration of SP-303, an aqueous soluble proanthocyanidin polymer composition isolated from *Croton* species, at a dose of 20 mg/kg once per day to treat secretory diarrhea in an animal. The reference teaches the mechanism of action of the compound as involving inhibition of fluid accumulation and cAMP-mediated Cl⁻ -

Art Unit: 1651

secretion in secretory diarrhea and suggests the wider therapeutic use of this material to humans and other animals in view of the effects demonstrated. See, e.g., Abstract.

Ubillas *et al.* teaches pharmaceutically compositions comprising a therapeutically effective amount of SP-303 an aqueous soluble proanthocyanidin polymer from *Croton lechleri*. The reference teaches these and similar materials are traditionally administered for the treatment of diarrhea and viral infections in conjunction with milk. Milk is not only a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, but also is known to protect compositions from the action of stomach acid, because of the natural neutralizing effects of its proteins, for example. See, e.g., page 78, col. 2, last paragraph.

The references differ from the claimed invention in the specific formulations and coatings to be provided. However, from the Ubillas at least it is clear that various formulations are provided in urban health food stores for various therapeutic and prophylactic purposes. In addition, in view of the recognized mechanism of action of proanthocyanidin polymer composition in the intestine to treat diarrhea, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to formulate SP-303 or similar aqueous soluble proanthocyanidin polymer from *Croton* or *Calophyllum* to protect them from premature degradation and/or inactivation by stomach acid.

Masquelier recognizes that proanthocyanidin may be administered orally in various stable forms that include coatings, for example (See, e.g., col. 6, lines 43-48) and Wursch teaches that related tannin polymers are administered in various forms that protect compositions from the action of stomach acid, including with milk (See, e.g., Example 12) and coated tablets (See, e.g., example 8).

Moreover, at page 16, first full paragraph of the specification, Applicants disclose that method of making the present formulations is well known in the art, with specific reference being made to "Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences" (See, e.g., pages 150-533 and pages 1585-1593). Slow release compositions are old and well-known in the art, as adequately demonstrated by applicants.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Davenport *et al.* and Ubillas *et al.* by providing compositions of aqueous soluble proanthocyanidins for oral ingestion which are formulated to

Art Unit: 1651

protect the proanthocyanidins from the stomach environment and that inhibit or neutralize stomach acid or which are slow release formulations according to the teachings of Masquelier and Wursch for functionally and structurally related polymers and of Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences for pharmaceutical compositions in general, since the references clearly teach that the technology is well known in the art and for the clear benefits to quality of life of providing compositions for treating secretory diarrhea by inhibiting fluid accumulation and cAMP-mediated Cl^- -secretion as demonstrated by Davenport *et al.*.

Thus, the claimed invention as a whole was clearly prima facie obvious, especially in the absence of sufficient, clear and convincing evidence to the contrary.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments and declarations have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant's declarations attempting to antedate the Davenport reference are defective in that the report # SP-303-E-074 is not executed. In addition, the signatures on Notebook 368 are absent or cut-off.

With respect to the assignment issue and 103(c), it is noted that MPEP 706.02(1)(2) states that:

The statement concerning common ownership should be clear and conspicuous (e.g., **on a separate piece of paper or in a separately labeled section**) in order to ensure that the examiner quickly notices the statement. Applicants may, but are not required to, submit further evidence, such as assignment records, affidavits or declarations by the common owner, or court decisions, *in addition to* the above-mentioned statement concerning common ownership.

Applicant has failed to follow these guidelines.

Therefore the rejection is deemed proper and it is adhered to.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Irene Marx whose telephone number is (571) 272-0919. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-3:00).

Art Unit: 1651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 .

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Irene Marx
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1651